

**Appl. No.** : 10/658,836  
**Filed** : August 21, 2003

### **REMARKS**

Claims 29, 56, 93, 131, 151, 165, and 166 have been amended. Claims 29-32, 35-43, 49, 56-58, 60-72, 93, 94, 96, 100-101, 103-106, 112, 113, 115, 117, 119-124, 131, 136, 144, 145, 151, 152, 155, 157, 161, 165, 166, and 167 remain pending and are presented for further examination

#### **I. Change to Inventorship**

By a Request to Amend Inventorship, filed herewith on even date, Applicant has deleted Mr. Michael Saunders as an inventor of the present application because no claim to which he contributed is presented in the present application.

#### **II. Interview with Examiner**

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview of December 16, 2007, a summary of which is provided herewith. Applicant believes the interview was helpful in advancing the case and invites the Examiner to call the undersigned if there are any remaining questions that might be resolved by further telephonic discussion.

#### **III. Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Rejection of Claims 29-32, 35-43, 49, 56-58, 60-72, 93, 94, 96, 100, 101, 103-106, 112, 113, 115, 117, 119-124, 131, 136, 144, 145, 151, 152, 155, 157, 161, and 165-167 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Wells and Harlick:**

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 29-32, 35-43, 49, 56-58, 60-72, 93, 94, 96, 100, 101, 103-106, 112, 113, 115, 117, 119-124, 131, 136, 144, 145, 151, 152, 155, 157, 161, and 165-167 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,636, 951 to Harlick ("Harlick") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,805,634 to Wells, et al. ("Wells"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that the claims would not have been obvious in view of cited references.

In particular, Applicant submits that Wells and Harlick, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose a third device, e.g., an authorization agent, "sending a message to the first gaming device wherein the message includes information authorizing the first

Appl. No. : 10/658,836  
Filed : August 21, 2003

gaming device to transfer the gaming information to the second gaming device wherein the first gaming device and the second gaming device are separate from the authorization agent” as recited in each of Claims 29, 56, and 165.

Applicant respectfully submits that Harlick teaches a “master-slave environment whereby the central computer initiates all responses” and the gaming “machines only speak when they are spoken to.” Harlick, column 3, lines 48-50. Harlick discloses a system in which the central computer sends a message wherein all of “the slot machines are all daisy-chained together, they all receive the message but only the selected machines will respond.” Harlick, col. 4, lines 40-42. Therefore, the network disclosed by Harlick is a “polled network” in which the devices are configured to talk only with the central computer and not with each other. Harlick, column 3, line 51. Hence, Applicant submits that Harlick fails to disclose a third device, e.g., an authorization agent, “sending a message to the first gaming device wherein the message includes information *authorizing the first gaming device to transfer the gaming information to the second gaming device* wherein the first gaming device and the second gaming device are separate from the authorization agent whereby *the first gaming device transfers the gaming information to the second gaming device in response to the message*” as recited in each of Claims 29, 56, and 165 because Harlick fails to disclose any data transfer between the poker machines (“gaming devices”).

Applicant submits that Wells also fails to disclose such features. In particular, as was noted in the response to the office action dated August 21, 2003, Wells merely discloses a system in which a source device can request identification information from a destination device prior to transferring gaming information to the destination device. Wells, col. 8, lines 36 – 38 and Well, col. 9 lines 66- Col. 10 line 2. Hence, Applicant submits that Wells and Harlick, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose a third device, e.g., an authorization agent, “sending a message to the first gaming device wherein the message includes information authorizing the first gaming device to transfer the gaming information to the second gaming device *wherein the first gaming device and the second gaming device are separate from the authorization agent* whereby the first gaming device transfers the gaming information to the second gaming device in response to the message” (emphasis added) as

**Appl. No.** : **10/658,836**  
**Filed** : **August 21, 2003**

recited in each of Claims 29, 56, and 165. Thus, Applicant submits that Harlick and Wells fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of Claims 29, 56, and 165.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 29, 56, and 165 are in condition for allowance. Further, as each of dependent Claims 30-32, 35-43, 49, 57-58, and 60-72 depends from one of Claims 29 or 56, or 165, Applicant submits that each of these dependent claims is also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Similarly, Claim 93 recites a first gaming device “sending the gaming transaction request to a gaming authorization agent that authorizes the transfer of gaming software from the send gaming device and receiving a message on the first gaming device from the authorization agent wherein the message includes information authorizing the first gaming device to transfer the gaming information to the second gaming device wherein the first gaming device and the second gaming device are separate from the authorization agent” and “transferring the gaming information to the second gaming device in response to receiving the message” This is similar to Claim 29 except written with reference to the first gaming device. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 93 is allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with reference to Claims 29, 56, and 165. Further, as each of dependent Claims 94, 96, 100-101, and 103-106 depends from Claim 93, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Similarly, Claim 112 recites a first gaming device “receiving a message on the first gaming device from the authorization agent wherein the message includes information authorizing the first gaming device to transfer the gaming information to the second gaming device wherein the first gaming device and the second gaming device are separate from the authorization agent” and “transferring the gaming information to the second gaming device.” This claim is similar to Claim 29 except with reference to the first gaming device. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 112 is allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with reference to Claims 29, 56, and 165. Further, as each of dependent Claims 113, 115, 117, and 119-124 depends from Claim 112, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Similarly, Claim 131 recites an authorization agent comprising a processor configured to “send a message to the first gaming device wherein the message includes information

**Appl. No.** : **10/658,836**  
**Filed** : **August 21, 2003**

authorizing the first gaming device to transfer the gaming information to the second gaming device wherein the first gaming device and the second gaming device are separate from the authorization agent whereby the first gaming device transfers the gaming information to the second gaming device in response to the message.” Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 131 is allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with reference to Claims 29, 56, and 165. Further, as each of dependent Claims 136, 144 and 145 depends from Claim 131, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Similarly, Claim 151 recites a processor configured to “receive from the authorization agent a reply approving or rejecting the request for the transfer of the gaming software information wherein the first gaming device and the second gaming device are separate from the authorization agent and [] transfer the gaming information to the second gaming device in response to receiving the message.” This claim is similar to Claim 29 except with reference to the first gaming device. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 151 is allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with reference to Claims 29, 56, and 165. Further, as each of dependent Claims 152, 155, 157, and 161 depends from Claim 151, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Similarly, Claim 166 recites a system comprising a game server which is configured to “send a message to the remote computer wherein the message includes information authorizing the gaming machine to transfer the gaming information to the remote computer wherein the gaming machine and the remote computer are separate from gaming server” and “wherein the gaming machine is further configured to transfer the gaming information to the remote computer in response to the message.” This claim is similar to Claim 29 except being directed to a system. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 166 is allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with reference to Claims 29, 56, and 165. Further, as dependent Claims 167 depends from Claim 166, Applicant submits that this dependent claim is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Although Applicant has not addressed all the issues of the dependent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant does not necessarily agree with the characterization and assessments of the dependent claims made by the Examiner, and

**Appl. No.** : **10/658,836**  
**Filed** : **August 21, 2003**

Applicant believes that each claim is patentable on its own merits. Claims 30-32, 35-43, 49, 57, 58, 60-72, 94, 96, 100, 101, 103-106, 113, 115, 117, 119-124, 136, 144, 145, 152, 155, 157, 161 and 167 are dependent either directly or indirectly on the above-discussed independent Claims 29, 56, 93, 112, 131, 151, 165 or 166. Applicant respectfully submits that pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4, the dependent claims incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer and include their own patentable features, and are therefore in condition for allowance.

**IV. No Disclaimers or Disavowals**

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicants are not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicants have made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

**V. Co-Pending Applications of Assignee**

Applicant wishes to draw the Examiner's attention to the following co-pending applications of the present application's assignee.

<b>Serial Number</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Filed</b>
11/841,557	CRYPTOGRAPHY AND CERTIFICATE AUTHORITIES IN GAMING MACHINES	August 20, 2007

**VI. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and, particularly, that all claims be allowed. If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that

**Appl. No.** : 10/658,836  
**Filed** : August 21, 2003

could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to call the undersigned. Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: January 9, 2008

By: 

John G. Rickenbrode  
Registration No. 57,067  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(619) 235-8550

4629229  
120707